

✓ Preserve

App. F. IX-4

Previous References

193
(Muzjar)

File No. 187-33

Serial Nos. 1-4

Later References.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 4

Part B for November 1934

SUBJECT.

Affidavit petition 2 Mailagiri Roro.
shenai 4/20/34 against the Muzjaris or
co-refer to him 11/25/34 main latches in
1/2

22 NOV

6:11 PM 27-10-34

Appeal petition of M. Hailgiri

[App. F. III-2]

General and Revenue
Secretariat

File No. 187 of 1934.

Serial
No.

1
After No. 726 dated
From the Muzrai Auditor
Forwards an application of
C. Mailgiri Rao, Muzrai clerk
Mandya Taluk of the district of
the order of the M.C. dated 11.12.1927
directing the Muzrai Auditor
for certain latches who is
clerk to the Muzrai

The petitioner M. Hailgiri Rao was the Muzrai
clerk in the district of Mysore, Tumkur from 15th
March 1928 to 16th March 1929, and the
facts of the case leading to the present appeal
relate to this period, as detailed below.

2 On 12th March 1928 one M. Tata Venkata
Subbiah of Madhugiri deposited in the local
Taluk Treasury a sum of Rs 1500/- on behalf of
his mother Sakamma the annual interest at
5% per year on this charitable endowment
being utilised for Dhatri Santalpane at
the place. The amount instead of being ^{kept} credited
as the P. B. ~~Deposit~~, pending acceptance
of the pudlak offer, was wrongly credited
in the funds of Sri Anjanyashwami temple
at Hospet.

3 Three weeks later on 2nd April 1928 the
Muzrai Auditor pointed out the mistake,
and instructions are reported to have been
issued to have the amount retransferred

WD 0434-GPB-15,000-12-10-33

Serial
No.

to the S. B. Deposits. The matter was under consideration between the Taluk Office and the Sub Office for nearly 8½ months from the 1st April 1928 to about the middle of December 1928. Thereafter the Murray Auditor's Notes was received in the St Office Tumkur on 17.12.1928 and forwarded to the M. C's Office on 7.1.29. The same Notes was referred to the D. C's Office on 19.2.1929 by the M. C's Office with instructions to set right the mistake pointed and it was retransmitted to the Sub Division Office on 7.3.1929. After further correspondence, the amount was actually transferred to the S. B. Deposits on 23.7.1930. Meanwhile the petitioner was transferred from the Tumkur St Office, to the Mysore St about 5 months prior to this adjustment, on 16.3.29.

Thus there was a delay of about 27 months getting the amount of Rs 1500^{Rs} credited (from wrong head) to the right head under S. B. Deposits, and this resulted in a loss of about 175 Rupees as interest at 5% per year on the said amount. As regards this inordinate delay, the D. C. Tumkur was reported that the Taluk Office Gurnanta Mr Venkatasubbiah who admitted the guilty was fully responsible for it. The Murray Commr however found both the Taluk Gurnanta and the St Office clerk Mr Mailguir Rao

General and Revenue
Secretariat

File No.

of 193 .

Serial
No.

Q

as responsible for this delay. As regards the latter, the order says: He received the Auditor's notes of inspection on 17.12.1928 and he should have taken action on this important matter before sending it up to this office. In assessing the liability, the order says that Rs 50/- should be recovered from Mr Mailgiri Rao and Rs 12.5/- from the Taluk Gumnasta.

5) It is against this order of recovery that the petitioner has preferred this appeal. The reasons which ^{he} has put forth, for setting aside the order in question, seem to be to the effect that the Audit notes pointing out the mistake referred to, was long delayed in the Taluk office for 8 months from April to December 1928, that when it was received on 17.12.1928 in the D.O. office, it was found to have contained the action taken against this particular item of objection noted against it ^{and} that he had therefore no other alternative except to submit it to the D.C. without causing further delay (as it was ^{alleged to be} pending for 15 days in the D.C. office) on the 7th Jan 1929. He further submits that it was the Taluk office that was solely responsible for the delay and the loss, if any, should be recovered therefrom, and not from him.

6) In this connection it is submitted that the clerk Mr Mailgiri Rao is to be responsible for a delay of 3 weeks

Serial
No.

first instance from 17.12 1928 to 7.1.29.
in transmitting the Audit Note, to the M.C's
Office and also for the delay of 15 days from
19.2.1929 to 7.3.29 in sending back
the same records to the Sub Division Office
for all a delay of about 36 days on his
part, and the D.C has clearly reported
that there has not been any appreciable
delay in the district office in the handling
of this record. The petitioner may therefore
be liable for the loss of interest on Rs 1500
at 5% per annum for 36 days, and this works
out to about Rs 7-2-0 and not Rs 50%.

P

- 8/ Besides the total loss of interest on Rs 1500
at 5% per annum for 27 months (delayed)
works out to Rs 17 57/- which has been
ordered by the M.C to be fully recovered
from the clerks concerned. But it is
not known whether this sum of Rs 1500 which
was credited in the Prjanaya Shrami
Temple funds at Hospet during this
period, carried any interest thereon,
and if so, whether the total interest
earned thereby should not be deducted
from the total loss incurred so far and
the balance of actual loss only be
ordered to be recovered. On this
basis the petitioner's liability does
not appear to go to the extent of
Rs 50/- ordered to be recovered

Appeal petition of Mr Mailgi Rao (Munayind)

[App. F. III-2]

General and Revenue
Secretariat

File No. 187 of 1933

Serial
No.

9) In the circumstances the prayer of the petitioner for cancellation of the order of the M.C is submitted for orders.


10) Please ^{specimens} $\frac{1}{2}$
31/1

11) To get a correct idea of the case and see how far the appellant is responsible it seems necessary to get the original records of the office and look into them. It appears ~~inadequate~~ $\frac{1}{2}$
 $\frac{1}{2}$

12) $\frac{1}{2}$
 $\frac{1}{2}$

13) A draft to the M.C is pending.

14) $\frac{1}{2}$
 $\frac{1}{2}$



2
P. A
16/2/34

1091 & 14.2.1934

The M.C in Mysore calls for the entire records of the case in the office including those in the Suban office and the Taluk office. Letter No 726 dated 28.6.1934 from the M.C in Mysore. Submit the records as called for, above.

Appeal petition of Mr Mailgir Rao (Muzrai clerk)

File No. 187 of 1937

General and Revenue
Secretariat

Serial
No.

187 The records relating to the case are
subd for orders with reference to paras
11-12 supra.

Please see
10/7

3
5/7

The Muzrai Auditor's notes refer
to in the correspondence of the lower offices
and the papers connected with
the action taken therein from about
17.12.1928 the date on which it is said
to have been read in the D.C. Office
to 7.2.1929 the date on which it
is also said to have been received
by the D.C. Office to the S.D. Modkh
giri, are not found in the records
now held from the M.C. These notes
and the connected papers seem to
be necessary for disposal of the appeal.

187 A draft to the M.C. calling for
same is per sup.

W
25/7

19 June 10/7

Inform
24/7



Appeal of Mr. Malingai Sub-Magistrate

General and Revenue
Secretariat

File No.

187

of 193

[App. F. III-2]

Serial
No.

3

Letter No. 126/33-36 of 24.5.34
From the Malingai Sub-Magistrate
To the Malingai District Officer
To be taken with corresponding orders, and to be
kept in file.

²⁰ The Malingai Auditor's Notes
referred to, above, are put up. In column 3
Remarks by the Auditor if any it is noted
"The Record in this connection is submitted
to the Sub-Division Officer Malingai Sub-
Division with W.M. No. 21/27-28 dated 5.5.28
for sanction". The remarks made in column
4 by the D.C. are not relevant to the point at
issue, as they were made long after the
petitioner's case was ordered by the M.C.

²¹ These Notes were received in the District
D.C.'s office on 17.12.1928 and the same was
forwarded to the M.C. with D.C.'s letter dated
31.12.1928, and the D.C. has stated in his
letter dated 23.9.1931 to the M.C. that "there
has been not been any appreciable delay
in the District office in the handling of this record"

²² The main charge against the petitioner
is that he received the Auditor's Notes &
in respect of 17.12.1928 and he should have
taken action in this important matter
before sending it up to this office

23 On this point the petitioner has submitted his explanation in paras 5 of his appeal petition to the effect that as the records mentioned in the Remarks Column 34, the Notes, had not been resorted as yet in the Deputy Commr's office it was not possible to know the exact situation at which the matter stood and that, further, as the Audit Report was long overdue and there was a reply against the objection, he had no other alternative but to submit the same to the Muzungu Commission.

24) Sub for orders with reference to paras 11, 12 and 19 supra.

ATS
13/9 m

P T O

General and Revenue
Secretariat

File No.

of 193

[App. F. III—2

Serial
No.

✓ These papers relate to the recovery of Rs. 175/- from the Muzrai Clerks of the Madhugiri Taluk Office and the Tumkur District Office being the ^{interest} due on the deposit of Rs. 1,500/- for "Dhatrī Santarpane".

✓ The facts of the case are:—On 12th March 1928 ~~one~~ one Mr. Venkatasubbiah of Madhugiri deposited in the -- local Treasury a sum of Rs. 1,500/- on behalf of his mother Sakamma with the request that the annual interest on the amount at 5% may be utilised for Dhatrī Santarpar at the place. The amount instead of being kept as a Savings Bank Deposit pending acceptance of the Pudukat offer was wrongly credited in the Taluk Office to the funds of the Sri Anjaneyaswami Temple at Hosapete.

✓ Three weeks later i.e., on 2nd April 1928 the Muzrai Auditor pointed out the mistake and instructions are reported to have been issued to have the amount transferred to Savings Bank Deposits. The records disclose that after prolonged correspondence action on the Auditor's instructions to invest the amount as a Deposit was taken only on 23rd July 1930 (27 months after the mistake was pointed out) on which date it was transferred to Savings Bank account of the Madhugiri Taluk office. As a result of the delay that was caused interest on the endowment~~s~~ for over 27 months was lost. In his order dated 27th September 1930 the Muzrai Commissioner while accepting the offer ordered that interest at the rate of 5% from 12th March 1928 to 23rd July 1930 should be recovered from the official who was responsible for crediting the amount to the funds of the Anjaneyaswami temple and the

File No.

of 193

General and Revenue
Secretariat

Serial
No.

clerk of the Deputy Commissioner's Office looking after Muzrai work for not taking prompt action even after the mistake was pointed out in the notes of the Muzrai -- Auditor. The amount thus to be recovered was Rs.175/-.

While assessing the responsibility of the two clerks referred to above the Muzrai Commissioner in his order dated 11th December 1931 accepted the Deputy Commissioner's finding that the Taluk office gumasta was fully responsible for the delay and observed that "the District Officer's Muzrai Clerk cannot absolve himself from responsibility. He received the Auditor's notes of inspection on 17-12-28 and he should have taken action in this important matter before sending it up to this- (Muzrai) Office" He accordingly ordered that Rs. 125/- may be recovered from the Taluk Office Muzrai Clerk and Rs. 50/- from the District Office Muzrai Clerk in instalments of Rs. 5/- a month.

29 In November 1933 the clerk of the District Officer's viz., Mr. H.C. Mailgiri Rao has submitted a representation to Government praying for the cancellation of the order passed by the Muzrai Commissioner. In this petition the chief reason urged by the clerk in support of his prayer is that the Audit notes were on receipt in the Deputy Commissioner's Office, sent to the Taluk office for necessary action, that they remained there from March to December 1928, that as they were received back with the remark "the connected records have been submitted to the Sub Division Officer with No. 21/27-28 dated 5-8-29" against this particular item and as the Audit report was long overdue in the Muzrai Commissioner's Office, he had no other alternative but to submit the same to the Muzrai

2/10/34

Mr Malagun Rao's representation on

General and Revenue
Secretariat

File No.

of 193

[App. F. III—2]

Serial
No.


Commissioner's Office without further delay. He adds that he worked as Muzrai Clerk in the Tumkur Deputy Commissioner's Office from 1-3-28 to 16-3-29 during which period the puduvat record did not pass through his hands and that therefore it was not possible ~~xxxx~~ for him to know the exact situation.

30 It is clear from the records that the Muzrai clerk of the Deputy Commissioner's Office has failed to issue clear instructions to the Taluk office when the Audit -- notes were first forwarded to the Taluk office, as they were sent for "necessary action" as stated by him, ~~The~~ matter being treated as "routine". Again when they were received back in December 1928 he has kept them for -- nearly three weeks only to submit them to the Muzrai Commissioner. Before submitting to the Muzrai Commissioner he could easily have taken orders of the Deputy Commissioner to instruct the Amildar to immediately transfer the amount to the Savings Bank Deposit. This he has failed to do. It is for these omissions that the Muzrai Commissioner ~~has~~ ordered that he should pay Rs. 50/-. Whether the amount levied is commensurate with the omission ~~on the part of~~ ^{for which} this clerk is ^{responsible to} for consideration.

If any reduction is made in this case, the amount payable by the Taluk office clerk will have to be correspondingly enhanced.

Ch: Secy)

3/10/34



NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

WD 0434—GPB—15,000—12-10-33

Mulgiri Rao's Appeal

General and Revenue
Secretariat

File No.

of 1933

Serial
No.

24) It is left to the M.C. regarding
the appeal is, under.

BBB
24/10

25/10



631 dated 27.10.34


The M.C. is hereby

instructed that there is no reason
to interfere with order passed and
that the appeal petition to the M.C.
is rejected.

BBB
7/11/34

M C. 13]

No. 726/33-34
Excl. 1



OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER
IN MYSORE.

Dated, Bangalore, 25th December 1933

FROM

N. Madhava Rau, Esq., B.A., P.L.,
~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

TO

S. Shamanna, Esq., P.A.,
Secretary to the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore.
Finance Department.

SIR,

I have the honor to forward herewith an application of Mr. H. C. Mailgiri Rau, Head Clerk of the Tanaya Taluk Office, received through the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District, with his Memo No. C3-N.Dis.1714/33-34 dated 24th November 1933, appealing against this office order directing the recovery of Rs. 50/- from him for certain latches when he was the Muzrai Clerk of the Tumkur District Office. This office orders Nos. P.C.425/29-30 dated 27-9-1930 and R.Dis.54/31-32 dated 11-12-1931 (contained in the files sent herewith) explain the facts of the case fully.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

N. Madhava Rau
Muzrai Commissioner.
25-12-33

To

THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
MYSORE DISTRICT, MYSORE.

Through,

The Amildar, Mandya Taluk, and
The Assistant Commissioner, Mandya Sub-Division.

Respected Sir,

I beg to submit herewith a petition appealing against the order of the Muzrai Commissioner, directing that a sum of Rs. should be recovered from me etc., and humbly request that the enclosed application may kindly be submitted to Government for favourable orders.

I beg to remain,


Respected Sir,

Your most obedient servant ,

H. C. Mailgiri Rao

Head Clerk, Taluk office,
Mandya.

12-10-33.



nr. No 1714/33-34
ve 3 Memo

Forwarded with Compliments to the
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore - Bangalore,
~~for consideration and orders.~~

B. L. Srinivas

24/11/33.

N. M.

Deputy Commissioner,
Mysore District.
At —

c 726/33-34
F. H. S.
B. C. M.

To

THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

B A N G A L O R E.

- - - - -

Respected Sir,

I beg to humbly submit a copy of the petition addressed the Muzrai Commissioner, in Mysore, to reconsider his Order, directing that a sum of Rs 50/- should be recovered from me for having transmitted the Audit Report wherein the wrong credit the Puduvat amount had been pointed out etc. It will be seen from the circumstances explained in the enclosed representation that I am not in any way responsible to share in the loss of the interest due on the Puduvat amount wrongly credited by the Taluk office to the Muzrai Funds. In fact there was no other alternative for me except to submit the Audit report which was long overdue in the Muzrai Commissioner's office. Further the action taken had been noted against the observation made about the wrong credit. Hence I request that the entire records may kindly be got and the order passed by the Muzrai Commissioner may kindly be cancelled in view of the circumstances explained by me.

For this act of kindness, I shall ever remain grateful.

I beg to remain,

Respected Sir,

Your most obedient and Humble Servant,

H. C. Mailgiri Rao
Head Clerk,
Taluk office, Mandya.

Taluk office still the necessary rectification was not effected. The Audit note was sent back with a reply against the objection as follows;

The connected records have been submitted to the Sub-Division Officer with No 21/27-28 dated 5-8-29. As the connected records had not ^{received} come even once to the Deputy Commissioner's office and as the Audit report was long over due in the Muzrai Commissioner's office and as the ^{taken} action had been noted against the particular objection, I had no other alternative except to submit the report to the Muzrai Commissioner with any more delay. In these circumstances I humbly submit I have not done anything beyond what was needed at that stage and for this act of mine have been ordered to pay Rs 50/- .

Above all , on receipt of Audit Notes the Muzrai Commissioner again sent a communication to the Deputy Commissioner stating that the wrong credit has not been transferred as pointed by the Auditor and the same should be done etc (Vide Letter No 1138/28-29 dated 18-2-1929). As the Taluk authorities had failed to carry out the instructions, the reference was sent to the Sub-Division Officer to report after doing the needful. It is seen from the records that he has issued instructions - thereon to carry out the instructions and to report in 15 days. Even this had not any ^{effect} effect and the result was that the amount remained in the Muzrai funds from 12-3-1928 to 23-7-1930 when they transferred the amount to S.B. Deposit after a lengthy correspondence.

I submit I worked as Muzrai Clerk in the Deputy Commissioner's Office Tumkur from 1-3-1928 to 16-3-1929 and during this period the Pudavat record did not pass my hands. As for the transmission of the Audit Notes I have explained the circumstances under which I have done it . The Taluk authorities did not take action even after the receipt of the Muzrai Commissioner's reference No 1138/28-29 dated 19.2.29 - received in the Taluk office on 18-3-1929 with Sub-Division Officer's No G1.6254 dated 12-3-1929. and I was transferred from that seat on 16-3-1929 and I am not aware of the further action, taken

Besides, the Amildar submitted the Pudavat record to the Sub-Division Officer with his No Muz 21/27-28 dated the 15-7-1928 for recommending the ~~acceptance~~ acceptance of the Pudavat endowment, who returned the record on 21-11-1928 alone with the observation that the object of crediting the Muzrai amount to the Muzrai Funds may be explained etc, Then the Audit Notes ~~Note~~ also was in the Taluk Office. Still they did

still they did not pay any attention .

Hence I submit the following facts for reconsideration and favour of orders:-

1. The Pudavat amount was allowed by those concerned for being credited to the Muzrai Funds in spite of the clear statutory provision

2. The Muzrai Auditor audited the accounts in the same month - Viz in March 1928 just a few days after the wrong credit and issued instructions personally to rectify the mistake when the record was also in the Taluk office . Still the Taluk office did not act up to it.

3. The Audit report itself was sent to the Taluk office which remained in the Taluk office from March to December 1928 wherein the wrong credit had been pointed out . The Taluk office did not take necessary action but returned the same with a reply against the objection stating that the corrected records had been submitted to the Sub-Division Office etc. As the records had not been received as yet in the Deputy Commissioner's office , it was not possible to know the exact situation at which the matter stood. Further as the Audit report was long over due and there was a reply against the objection I had no other alternative but to submit the same to the Muzrai Commissioner.

4. Above all the Taluk office did not take ^{any} action to transfer the amount to S.B. Deposit instnce of Muzrai Commissioner's further instructions communicated with Sub-Division Officer's No G16254 dated 12-3-1929, as a result of which the amount ^{continued to} remained in the Muzrai Funds.

5. I worked as Muzrai Clerk only from 1-3-1928 to 16-3-1929 and I am not aware of the further correspondence .

For the above reasons I submit that as already reported by the Deputy Commissioner it is the Taluk office that is responsible and the I have explained the circumstances under which I had to transmit the Audit Note . In view of these facts I humbly request that the order may kindly be reconsidered and I may be absolved from the levy.

" Copy "
H. Mailgiri Rao
Head clerk
Taluk office, Mandya.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient and humble servant,
Sd/ H. Mailgiri Rao.
Clerk
Mandya Sub-Division Office

SUBJECT

Diary No. of letter replied to

General and Revenue Secretariat

()

the

193 .

Date of issue 14/2/34

Signed by *Mr B. Muddukrishna*

List of enclosures

Copied by *BW 12/2*

Examined by

Section

File No.

Serial No.

*neg**187-33**2*

No.

1091 here

To

*The M.C in Mysore**Sir*

With reference to your letter
No 726/33-4 dated 26.12.1933
regarding the appeal petition
of the Mailgi Rao, Haveli
clerk to the Moudra ^{Taluk} Office,
praying for cancellation of your
order dated 11.12.1931 directing the
recovery from him of Rs 50/- for
certain catches when he was the
Chieftain Clerk of the Or Office
Tumkur, I am directed to
request you to be so good as
to submit for reference and

Include, the entire original
records of the case, available in
the office of the D.C. ~~Attorney General~~ ^{Attorney General} (Include D including
~~the~~ ^{more in the}
Division Office and ~~at~~ the State
Office, Washington

I have etc

10/1/34

For M. L. King
H.S.



FINANCIAL SECRETARIAT,

From

Financial Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore

Bangalore.


Financial Secretary to Government.

AK


No

726 Eve/7ile
33-34

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER IN MYSORE,



N MADHAVA RAU, ESQ, B.A., F.L.S.
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,
Bangalore



2
29/6

N Madhava Rau

SUBJECT

Section

File No.

Serial No.

Diary No. of letter replied to

No. 118 in ac 42 file

To

The M. e. in the line

General and Revenue Secretariat

the 193 .

Date of issue 28/1/34

Signed by M. B. Mudalukrishnaiah

Sir,

With reference to correspondence ending with your letter no 726/33 dated 28.6.1934 relating to the appeal of the Mailgram No. 118, I am directed to state that the Mysore Audit's notes sent to in the file correspondence are the papers connected with the action taken thereon in the D. C.'s office from about 17.12.1928 to 7.3.1934. ~~are~~ not found in the records & recorded with your letter no. 118 and to request the same may kindly be obtained and forwarded to this office.

Yours faithfully

List of enclosures

Copied by

Examined by

for personal and return.

The connected files
are returned herewith for
reference and reimbursement
I have etc

2/25/17

For Dr. Lee's papers
Not
2/24/17

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

FINANCIAL SECRETARIAT.

Dated, Bangalore,

193

No.

118
May
In 1 + 2 files

28th

From

The Financial Secretary to the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore.

To

The Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,

B a n g l o r e .

Sir,

With reference to correspondence ending with your -
letter No. 726/33-34 dated 28th June 1934 relating to the appeal
of Mr. Mailpuri Rau, Muzrai Clerk, I am directed to state that the
Muzrai Auditor's notes referred to in the correspondence and
the papers connected with the action taken thereon in the Deputy
Commissioner's office from about 17th December 1928 to 7th March
1929 are not found in the records now received with your letter
under advertance and to request that the same may kindly be -
obtained and forwarded to this office for perusal and return.

The connected files are returned herewith for -
reference and retransmission.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

For Financial Secretary to Government.

bnl.3

No 726
33-34

OFFICE OF THE Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,

238
30 AUG 1934

Bangalore, 18/8/1934

N. MADHAVA RAU, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,
Bangalore.

Secretary to the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore,
..... Department

With reference to your letter dated 14/8/34, regarding the
ly 1934 on the above subject, I have the honor to inform you
ewith the records of the collection of the above mentioned
ted records as desired in the letter dated 14/8/34.
ice collections Nos. P. Dis. 54(4)/51-30 and D1 21-1-34
also enclosed for reference and kind return.

I have the honor to be,
Your most obedient servant,
N. Madhava Rau
Muzrai Commissioner.

SUBJECT

Diary No. of letter replied to

General and Revenue Secretariat

()
the 193 .

Date of issue 21-10-34

Signed by 3. Muddachinnappa

AC
AC

List of enclosures

Copied by 26/10

Examined by

Section

Muz

File No.

187-33

Serial No.

4.

No.

631 Letter + Records

To

The M.C in Mysore
Sri

With reference to Colloquy
ending with your letter NO 226/33.
dated 29.8.1934 regarding
the appeal of Mr Mailgudi Rao
Houd clerk of the Mandya TK
Office requesting for revision
of the order passed by your
predecessor in office directing
issuing from him of Rs 50 for
certain latches on the back
of the official vehicle he was
Muzgudi Clerk in Tumkur as
officer, I am directed to

State that Govt see no
reason to interfere with the
order^{passed} and that the appeal

petition is rejected
The records need with your letter are returned
herewith I have etc

25/10

For chief Secy Secy
23/10